I. The Securities and Exchange Commission (“Commission”) deems it appropriate and in the public interest that public administrative proceedings be, and hereby are, instituted pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”), against Alicia Bryan (“Respondent” or “Bryan”).

II. After an investigation, the Division of Enforcement alleges that:

A. RESPONDENT

1. Respondent was the managing director of A&B Consulting, LLC, a company she formed in Nevada in August 2011. She was the lead sales agent in unregistered offerings of securities in the Maxum Gold Trade Program. Bryan is not registered with the SEC in any capacity, and acted as an unregistered broker. Bryan, age 43, resides in Bossier City, Louisiana.

B. ENTRY OF THE INJUNCTION

2. On June 10, 2014, a final judgment by default was entered against Bryan, permanently enjoining her from future violations of Sections 5(a), 5(c), and 17(a)(2) of the Securities Act of 1933 (“Securities Act”), and Sections 10(b) and 15(a) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5(b) thereunder, in the civil action entitled Securities and Exchange Commission v.
The Commission’s complaint alleged that, from at least July 2010 until at least the summer of 2013, Bryan offered and sold securities in unregistered offerings based on materially false representations and omissions without being registered as a broker, in furtherance of a Ponzi scheme by which more than $5.6 million was raised from over fifty United States investors. Among other false representations, Bryan told investors that the Maxum Gold Trade Program was a “low risk” investment with returns ranging between 4-8% per month and claimed investor funds would be placed in escrow to facilitate a bank trade program. In fact, the Maxum Gold Trade Program was not real; instead, it was a Ponzi scheme. Pursuant to the Ponzi scheme, Bryan received $226,676.

III.

In view of the allegations made by the Division of Enforcement, the Commission deems it necessary and appropriate in the public interest that public administrative proceedings be instituted to determine:

A. Whether the allegations set forth in Section II hereof are true and, in connection therewith, to afford Respondent an opportunity to establish any defenses to such allegations;

B. What, if any, remedial action is appropriate in the public interest against Respondent pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Exchange Act.

IV.

IT IS ORDERED that a public hearing for the purpose of taking evidence on the questions set forth in Section III hereof shall be convened at a time and place to be fixed, and before an Administrative Law Judge to be designated by further order as provided by Rule 110 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. § 201.110.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent shall file an Answer to the allegations contained in this Order within twenty (20) days after service of this Order, as provided by Rule 220 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. § 201.220.

If Respondent fails to file the directed answer, or fails to appear at a hearing after being duly notified, the Respondent may be deemed in default and the proceedings may be determined against her upon consideration of this Order, the allegations of which may be deemed to be true as provided by Rules 155(a), 220(f), 221(f) and 310 of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.155(a), 201.220(f), 201.221(f) and 201.310.

This Order shall be served forthwith upon Respondent personally or by certified mail.
IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Administrative Law Judge shall issue an initial decision no later than 210 days from the date of service of this Order, pursuant to Rule 360(a)(2) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice.

In the absence of an appropriate waiver, no officer or employee of the Commission engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions in this or any factually related proceeding will be permitted to participate or advise in the decision of this matter, except as witness or counsel in proceedings held pursuant to notice. Since this proceeding is not “rule making” within the meaning of Section 551 of the Administrative Procedure Act, it is not deemed subject to the provisions of Section 553 delaying the effective date of any final Commission action.

For the Commission, by its Secretary, pursuant to delegated authority.

Jill M. Peterson
Assistant Secretary